

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 89 and 115 - 127 are pending. Claims 90 - 114 have been cancelled. Claims 44 and 70 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

In the August 9, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 89 and 115 – 127 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,658,248 to Lee (“the Lee reference”) in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0077974 to Ortiz (“the Ortiz reference”). This rejection is respectfully traversed in so far as it is applicable to the presently pending claims.

The applicants would like to address the Lee reference. The Lee reference is similar to the system disclosed on page 3 and Fig. 1B of the application and described as prior art. Specifically, the Lee reference discloses that all transaction devices (self-service machines like vending machines) connect to a central server over an external network and do not communicate directly with portable wireless devices. The invention recited in the present application’s claims recites that the self-service device connects to the central server via or utilizing the portable wireless device, effectively piggy-backing on the portable wireless device’s network connection.

Claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over the cited references. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A wireless network system, comprising:  
a server system connected to a network;  
an electronic device having a wireless transceiver adapted to communicate via at least one of light transmission and radio frequency (RF) transmission; and  
**a portable wireless device having a wireless connection to the network, wherein the portable wireless device communicates wirelessly with the electronic device through the wireless transceiver of the electronic device, and communication from the electronic device to the server system goes through the portable**

**wireless device.**

The Lee reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the wireless network system according to claim 1, as amended. The Examiner states that the portable wireless device (reference numeral 220 in Fig. 2 of the Lee reference) communicates wirelessly with the electronic device (which the Examiner states is disclosed as Fig. 2 and in col. 3, lines 7 – 20 of the Lee reference). Further, the Examiner states that the user in the Lee reference utilizes the cellular phone 500, can access a telephone service system 580, and that the price information is transmitted to the self-service machine from the telephone service system 580. (*Office Action, page 3*). Specifically, in the Lee reference, a user directly accesses the telephone service center 580 utilizing a wired / wireless phone. Then, the user enters a price request into a voice mail system of the telephone service center 580. The user then enters information required for using the self-service machine under the guidance of the VMS. After the user has completed entering this information, the self-service machine is connected through radio paging. The self-service machine receives a radio signal including the ID information of the self-service machine and the price information from the telephone service center 580. (*Lee, col. 4, lines 30 – 65*).

In other words, a customer connects to an external communications network 210 using a cellular phone 220. The user enters a price request under the guidance of the voice mail system (VMS) of the communications network 210. The price information is then transmitted to the self-service machine 200 via the external communications network 210 and the customer is served according to the price information. (*Lee, col. 3, lines 7 – 20*). In other words, the communication path is from the cellular phone to a

server (housing the voice mail function) and then to a self-service machine. In the Lee reference, there is no direct communications between the cellular phone and the self-service machine.

This is not the same as a system including a server system connected to a network, an electronic device having a wireless transceiver adapted to communicate via at least one of light transmission and radio frequency (RF) transmission, and a portable wireless device having a wireless connection to the network, **wherein the portable wireless device communicates wirelessly with the electronic device through the wireless transceiver of the electronic device, and communication from the electronic device to the server system goes through the portable wireless device.**

It is not the same because the portable wireless device of the Lee reference device does not communicate wirelessly with the self-service machine (which is akin to the electronic device). In contrast, the portable wireless device of the Lee reference communicates only with voice mail system of the telephone service system. The telephone service system 280 (or external communications network 210) then communicates with the self-service machine. Further, the Lee reference communication path is from the cellular phone 220 to the external communications network 210 (including voice mail service) to the self-service machine 230. In contrast, claim 1, as amended, recites a communication path of **electronic device to the server system which goes through the portable wireless device.** In other words, Lee is disclosing 1) wireless device; 2) server; and then 3) self-service machine while claim 1, as amended, recites 1) electronic device (self-service machine); 2) wireless device; and 3) server. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended,

distinguishes over the Lee reference.

The Ortiz reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the Lee reference. The Examiner utilizes the Ortiz reference to disclose that a radio transceiver utilizes light transmission. (*Office Action, page 3*). The Ortiz reference also discloses that a wireless connection is selected from a group consisting of a Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol connection, a satellite connection, a GSM connection, a CDMA connection, a TDMA connection, a cellular digital packet connection, a general packet radio service connection, or a wideband CDMA connection. (*Office Action, page 4*). Assuming, *arguendo*, that the Ortiz reference discloses all that the Examiner states that it does, the Ortiz reference does not disclose a system including a server system connected to a network, an electronic device having a wireless transceiver adapted to communicate via at least one of light transmission and radio frequency (RF) transmission, and a portable wireless device having a wireless connection to the network, **wherein the portable wireless device communicates wirelessly with the electronic device through the wireless transceiver of the electronic device, and communication from the electronic device to the server system goes through the portable wireless device.** Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over the Lee / Ortiz combination.

Independent claim 12, as amended, recites limitations similar to independent claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submits that claim 12, as amended, distinguishes over the Lee / Ortiz combination for reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 1, as amended.

Claims 2 – 3, 6 – 11, 13 – 18, and 20 – 21, depend, indirectly on independent

claims 1 and 12, both as amended. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 – 3, 6 – 11, 13 – 18, and 20 – 21 distinguish over the Lee / Ortiz combination for the same reasons as those discussed above in regard to claim 1, as amended.

Claim 37 distinguishes over the cited references. Claim 37 recites:

A method of wireless communication by a portable wireless device, comprising:

**establishing wireless communication, by the portable wireless device, with an electronic device via at least one of light transmission and radio frequency (RF) transmission;**

establishing a separate wireless connection to a network, wherein a server system is connected to the network;

**receiving, at the portable wireless device, data destined for the server system wirelessly from the electronic device;**

transmitting the data destined for the server system over the network via the wireless connection to the server system;

**receiving data destined for the electronic device from the server system over the network via the wireless connection; and**

**transmitting the data destined for the electronic device wirelessly to the electronic device.**

The Lee reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the method of wireless communication by a portable wireless device of claim 37, as amended. The Examiner, in rejecting claim 37, states that the Lee discloses receiving data destined for the server system wireless from the electronic device in col. 6, lines 42- 45. (*Office Action, page 8*). Specifically, column 6 of the Lee reference is the claims section of the Lee reference. Lines 42 – 45 of the Lee reference specifically recite “receiving a radio signal and extracting the identification information of the self-service machine and the price information from the radio signal in the self-service machine.”

This is not the same as **receiving, at the portable wireless device, data destined for the server system from the electronic device**. First, col. 6, lines 42 – 45 of the Lee reference is not disclosing **receiving data at the portable wireless**

**device** because it is disclosing receiving information at the self-service machine (the self-service machine being akin to the electronic device of claim 37). In addition, the data cannot be from the electronic device because in the Lee reference, the data is being received at the same self-service machine, i.e., electronic device of claim 37. Further, the data is not **destined for the server system** because the identification information and price information is being transmitted from the server system to the self-service machine (e.g., the electronic device). Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 37 distinguishes over the Lee reference.

Claim 37, as amended, further distinguishes over the Lee reference. The Lee reference does not disclose a method including **establishing wireless communication, by the portable wireless device, with an electronic device via at least one of light transmission and radio frequency (RF) transmission**. In contrast, the portable wireless device in the Lee reference establishes wireless communication with the server and there is no disclosure that the portable wireless device in the Lee reference establishes communication with the self-service machine (e.g., the electronic device of claim 37).

In addition, the Lee reference does not disclose a method for wireless communication including **receiving data destined for the electronic device from the server system over the network via the wireless connection and transmitting the data destined for the electronic device wirelessly to the electronic device**. As noted above, there is no disclosure that the wireless electronic device receives data destined for the electronic device because in the Lee reference, the electronic device communicates only with the server system to interface with the voice mail system (to

request services or prices) and does not receive any data that is destined for the self-service machine, which is akin to the electronic device of claim 37. Nor does the Lee reference disclose that the portable wireless device communicates with the self-service machine much less transmits **the data destined for the electronic device wirelessly to the electronic device**, as is recited in claim 37, as amended. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 37, as amended, distinguishes over the Lee reference.

The Ortiz reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the Lee reference. Assuming, *arguendo*, that the Ortiz reference discloses all that the Examiner states that it does, the Ortiz reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the highlighted limitations of claim 37, as amended. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 37, as amended, distinguishes over the Ortiz / Lee combination.

Independent claims 22 and 44 recite limitations similar to claims 37, as amended. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 22 and 44 distinguish over the Lee / Ortiz combination for reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 37. Claims 23 – 26, 29 – 36, 38 – 43, and 45 – 50 depend, indirectly or directly, on independent claims 22, 37, and 44. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 23 – 26, 29 – 36, 38 – 43, and 45 – 50 distinguish over the Lee / Ortiz combination for the same reasons as those discussed above in regard to claim 37.

Claim 63, as amended, further distinguishes over the cited references. Claim 63, as amended, recites:

A method of wireless communication by an electronic device,  
comprising:

establishing a first wireless connection with a portable wireless device via at least one of light transmission and radio frequency (RF) transmission, wherein the portable wireless device has a second wireless connection to the network, and a server system is connected to the network;

transmitting data destined for the server system wirelessly via the first wireless connection to the portable electronic device, wherein the portable wireless device transmits the data destined for the server system over the network via the second wireless connection to the server system; and

receiving data destined for the electronic device, wherein the portable wireless device receives the data destined for the electronic device from the server system over the network via the second wireless connection and transmits the data destined for the electronic device wirelessly via the first wireless connection to the electronic device.

The Lee reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the method of claim 63, as amended. The Lee reference does not disclose any of the highlighted limitations. For example, the Lee reference does not disclose that the **a first wireless communication is established between the electronic device and the portable wireless device**, as is recited in claim 63. There is no disclosure that the self-service machine of the Lee reference ever is in communication directly with the portable wireless device because the self-service machine of Lee communicates directly with a server (telephone communication system) over a network, but never communicates or transmits directly to the portable wireless device. The Examiner never addresses this limitation of claim 63 (see page 8 of the Office Action).

The Examiner states that the Lee reference discloses transmitting data destined for the server system over the network via the wireless connection to the server system in col. 6, lines 39 – 41 (the claims of the Lee reference). Specifically, lines 39 – 41 of the Lee reference disclose “sending the identification information of the self-service machine and the price information, as a radio signal, from the external communications



system" (the external communications system being akin to the server of claim 63). In other words, the Lee reference is disclosing that the server transmits identification and price information directly to the self-service machine, which is not the same as an electronic device **transmitting data, destined for the server system, wirelessly to the portable electronic device, wherein the portable wireless device transmits the data destined for the server system over the network via the second wireless connection to the server system.** It is not the same because Lee is disclosing transmitting data from a server to a self-service machine (akin to the electronic device) and claim 63 is reciting transmitting data from an electronic device to a portable wireless device and then to a server system. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 63 further distinguishes over the cited references.

Further, the Lee reference does not disclose a method including wherein the portable wireless device receives the data destined for the electronic device from the server system over the network via the second wireless connection and **transmits the data destined for the electronic device wirelessly to the electronic device.** The Examiner states that Lee reference (in column 4, lines 41 – 48) discloses transmitting the data destined for the electronic device wirelessly to the electronic device. Specifically, in col. 4, lines 41 – 48, the Lee reference discloses that the telephone service system 580 transmits the price information with identification information to the self-service machine via the radio paging switching center. This is not the same as the **portable wireless device transmitting the data destined for the electronic device wirelessly to the electronic device** because the Lee reference is disclosing the telephone service system, akin to the claimed server, transmitting the information to the

self-service machine and not the portable wireless device. Accordingly, claim 63, as amended, further distinguishes over the Lee reference.

The Ortiz reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the Lee reference. The Examiner utilizes the Ortiz reference to disclose infrared communication, Bluetooth protocol, and the IEEE 802.11 protocol. (*Office Action, page 7*). The Ortiz reference is also utilized to disclose that a wireless connection may utilize a TCP/IP connection, a satellite connection, a GSM connection, a CDMA connection, etc. (*Office Action, page 4*). Assuming, *arguendo*, that the Ortiz reference discloses all that the Examiner states that it does, the Ortiz reference does not disclose the above-highlighted limitations of claim 63, as amended. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 63, as amended, distinguishes over the Lee / Ortiz combination.

Independent claims 70 and 77, both as amended, recite similar limitations to independent claim 63. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 70 and 77 distinguish over the Lee / Ortiz combination for reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 63.

Claims 64 – 69, 71 – 76, 78 – 81, and 84 – 89, depend, indirectly or directly on independent claims 63, 70, and 77. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 64 – 69, 71 – 76, 78 – 81, and 84 – 89 distinguish over the Lee / Ortiz combination for the same reasons as those discussed above in regard to claim 63.

Claim 115 distinguishes over the cited references. Claim 115, as amended, recites:

A method of wireless communication by a stationary node,  
comprising:

**collecting data, at the stationary node, to be transmitted to a  
server system connected to a network;**

**establishing, by the stationary node, wireless communication with a portable wireless device via at least one of light transmission and radio frequency (RF) transmission, wherein the portable wireless device has a wireless connection to the network; and**

transmitting the data wirelessly to the portable wireless device, wherein the portable wireless device transmits the data to the server system over the network via the wireless connection to the server system.

The Lee reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest the method of claim 115, as amended. The Lee reference does not disclose **the collecting of data at the self-service machine**. The Lee reference discloses only that price information and identification information of the self-service machine are input as voice signals to a communication system which is a voice mail system. There is no disclosure that the self-service machine itself collects data that is to be transferred to the voice mail system (which is akin to the server system of claim 115). Also, as noted above, there is no disclosure in the Lee reference of a method including **establishing, by the stationary node, wireless communication with a portable wireless device via at least one of light transmission and radio frequency (RF) transmission**. There is no disclosure in the Lee reference of the self-service machine establishing a wireless communication with a portable wireless device, as is recited in claim 115. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 115, as amended, distinguishes over the Lee reference. The Ortiz reference does not make up for the deficiencies of the Lee reference. The Ortiz reference does not disclose, teach, or suggest any of the highlighted limitations of claim 115, as amended. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 115, as amended, distinguishes over the Lee / Ortiz combination.

Claim 121 recites limitations similar to claim 115, as amended. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 121 distinguishes over the Lee / Ortiz

combination for reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 115.

Claims 116 – 120 and 122 – 126 depend, indirectly or directly, on claims 115 and 121, respectively. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claims 116 – 120 and 122 – 126 distinguish over the Lee / Ortiz combination for the same reasons as those discussed above in regard to claim 115.

Claim 127 distinguishes over the cited references. Claim 127 recites:

A method of non-real-time wireless communication to a designated stationary node, comprising:

selecting a portable wireless device that travels within a personal area network (PAN) of the designated stationary node; and

transmitting wirelessly, from a server system connected to a network, data for the designated stationary node over the network to the portable wireless device, **wherein the portable wireless device travels within the personal area network (PAN) of the designated stationary node and transmits wirelessly the data to the designated stationary node over the personal area network via at least one of light transmission and radio frequency (RF) transmission.**

There is no disclosure in the Lee reference that a **portable wireless device travels within an PAN of the self-service machine** (akin to the designated stationary node of claim 127) and that it **transmits wirelessly data collected by the stationary node over the PAN of the stationary node**, as is recited in claim 127. The Lee reference does not disclose that the self-service machine ever transmits to the portable wireless device. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 127 distinguishes over the Lee reference. The Ortiz reference does make up for the deficiencies of the Lee reference. The Ortiz reference does not disclose that highlighted limitation of claim 127. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claim 127 distinguishes over the Ortiz / Lee combination.

Claims 128 – 132 depend, indirectly or directly, on claim 127. Accordingly,

applicant respectfully submits that claim 127 distinguishes over the Ortiz / Lee combination for the same reasons as those discussed above in regard to claim 127.

Applicants believe that the foregoing amendments and place the application in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 should the examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

Date: January 9, 2006

By: 

Mark Kendrick  
Registration No. 48468  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406  
Telephone: (213) 488-7100  
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033